

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application Date: March 31, 2016

Applicant: John Villarreal, owner

Property: 8503 Glencrest Street, Lot 24, Block 12, Glenbrook Valley Sec 6 Subdivision. The property includes a 1,502 square foot, one-story, wood frame and brick veneer single-family residence and attached garage situated on a 8,334 square foot interior lot.

Significance: Noncontributing Traditional Ranch residence, constructed circa 1959, located in the Glenbrook Valley Historic District.

Proposal: Alteration – In March 2016, the proposal to remove the partial height, brick front porch wall the spans the front walkway of the residence was denied by the HAHC.

The applicant now proposes to retain the remaining existing wall, and, at the portion where the bricks were previously removed to repair the house, the applicant proposes to create a stepped in brick pattern in order to retain as many original bricks as possible.

See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 4-9 for further details.

Public Comment: No public comment received at this time.

Civic Association: The Glenbrook Valley Civic Association is not in support of the project. See Attachment A.

Recommendation: Approval

HAHC Action: -

APPROVAL CRITERIA**ALTERATIONS TO NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES**

Sec. 33-241.1(b): Director shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration, rehabilitation, or restoration of a non-contributing structure or an addition to a **noncontributing structure in an historic district** upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria, as applicable:


S D NA**S - satisfies D - does not satisfy NA - not applicable**

- (1) For an alteration, rehabilitation, or restoration that does not require the removal or replacement of the structural elements, not including the foundation, within 67 percent of the structure:
- ☒ ☐ ☐ (a) The proposed activity must recognize the building, structure, object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance; and
- ☒ ☐ ☐ (b) The proposed activity must match the architectural features, materials, and character of either the existing noncontributing structure or the contributing structures within the context area.
- ☐ ☐ ☒ (2) For an alteration, rehabilitation, or restoration that requires the removal or replacement of the structural elements, not including the foundation, within 67 percent or more of the structure, the director shall refer the application to the HAHC, which shall approve a certificate of appropriateness if the result of the project conforms to the requirements for new construction in a historic district in section 33-242 of this Code.
- (3) For an addition to a noncontributing structure:
- ☐ ☐ ☒ (a) The distance from the property line to the front and side walls, porches, and exterior features of any proposed addition or alteration must be compatible with the distance from the property line of similar elements of existing contributing structures in the context area; and
- ☐ ☐ ☒ (b) The noncontributing structure with the constructed addition is compatible with the typical proportions and scale of existing contributing structures in the context area.



PROPERTY LOCATION

GLENBROOK VALLEY HISTORIC DISTRICT



8503 Glencrest

INVENTORY PHOTO



PHOTOS

FRONT WALL DETAIL



PHOTOS

FRONT WALL DETAIL



PHOTOS

FRONT WALL DETAIL



PHOTOS

FRONT WALL DETAIL



PROPOSED DESIGN (APPROXIMATION)

FRONT WALL DETAIL



PROJECT DETAILS

Exterior Materials: The existing residence and front wall features bricks that are 11½" wide x 2" tall x 3½" deep.

The house was in need of foundation repair which led to many of the bricks on the main structure to crack; many were cracked in half or had ¼" wide cracks. While repairing the foundation, these cracked bricks needed to be replaced. The applicant searched for matching brick around Houston, but was unable to locate any.

After the foundation was repaired, the applicant decided to use the matching bricks from the front porch wall to replace the damaged bricks on the main structure. The front porch wall was then partially dismantled. See photos for more detail.

The applicant claims that the front porch wall was in disrepair and prevents rainwater from flowing away from the house, potentially causing the foundation damage.

March 2016: The applicant proposes to remove the wall altogether and create several detached planting beds surrounding the front entrance and walkway.

April 2016: The applicant proposes to retain the remaining existing wall, and, at the portion where the bricks were previously removed to repair the house, the applicant proposes to create a stepped in brick pattern in order to retain as many bricks as possible. See proposed design approximation for more detail.